THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. V. JUNE, 1925. No. 6.

The Influence of Calvinism on the American System of Education.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER, St. Louis, Mo.

(Read before the Western District Teachers' Conference and published by request.)

PART I.

Introductory.

The topic assigned to me is certainly one of great importance, — in fact, so much so that justice can hardly be done to it within the allotted space of time and in an essay as brief as this must needs be. All that can be done is to suggest a bare outline of the topic, together with a few noteworthy characteristics of American education which are due to the influence of Calvinism.

Definition of Terminology.

In order thoroughly to understand the subject, it is necessary to define its component parts. In the first place, we must know what the term Calvinism implies and in what sense it is here used. As is well known, the term Calvinism is ambiguous, inasmuch as it is currently employed in two or three senses, closely related indeed, but of varying latitudes of connotation. First, Calvinism designates merely the individual teaching or teachings of John Calvin. Again, it designates, in a broader way, the *doctrinal system* confessed by that body of Protestant churches known historically, in distinction from Lutheran churches, as the "Reformed churches," or the "Calvinistic churches," because the greatest scientific exposition of their faith was given by John Calvin. Lastly, the term Calvinism designates, in a still broader sense, the entire body of conceptions — theological, ethical, philosophical, social, political — which under the influence of the master mind of John Calvin raised itself to dominance in the Protestant lands of the post-Reformation age and has left a permanent mark not

only upon the *thought,* but also upon the *life* and *history* of man, upon the social order of civilized peoples, and even upon the political organization of States. (See *Schaff-Herzog Enc. s. v.* "Calvinism," by Benj. B. Warfield.) In the present article the term will, for obvious reasons, be taken in the third of these senses. When we speak of the influence of Calvinism on the American system of education, we have in mind such particular conceptions, traits and characteristics, affecting especially religion, as may be traced back to the work of John Calvin.

However, also the phrase "the American system of education" ought to be qualified, so that the scope of this essay may be clear from the start. It has been suggested that in a strict sense we cannot yet speak of an American system of education, although this term is being widely used. We have a system of schools, of schedules, of grading, etc., but an American system of education, in a truly philosophical and logical sense of the term, is still lacking. L. R. Klemm, in his *Public Education in Germany and in the United States,* quotes the editor of *World's Work* as saying: "We Americans do not live by any philosopher's plan or by any book-made scheme. A patch of anarchy on a cloth of orderliness; a piece of high wisdom here and a piece of low folly there — we take what we *will,* or what we *must* for the instant *need.* The theorists of every sort must do the best they can to catalog or to coordinate such political and social phenomena as exist at the same time in Massachusetts, South Carolina, Oklahoma, and Colorado. This is hard on the theory-builders; but the people seem to thrive reasonably well by these unorderly and unclassifiable zigzag methods of working out a democracy. It is equally easy to praise and to blame, to fear and to trust, according to one's mood. The best of it all is, one's fear or trust, or blame or praise, does not in the least interfere with the orbic quality of our swing forward." This applies also to education. Hence, when we employ the phrase "American system of education," we use it in the broader sense of "American education," in the same way as this term is used by Sarah A. Burstall in her book *Impressions of American Education in 1908,* or in the sense which Boone implies in his *Education in the United States.* We do this, however, also for another reason. While Calvinism has not contributed anything to an American *system* of education, it has certainly greatly influenced public education in our country, especially in its political, religious, and social aspects. Thus defined, the subject would read: What have

the theological, philosophical, social, and political conceptions which had their inception in the mind of John Calvin and his colaborers contributed to the shaping and molding of education in our country?

Life of John Calvin.

In order to answer this question, it is necessary that we first study the main events in the life of John Calvin; for the influence which a man exerts, be it wholesome or otherwise, depends largely upon his character and life. John Calvin was a Frenchman, born at Noyon, July 10, 1509, eight years before Luther posted his theses at Wittenberg. His father, Gerard Chauvin, was a notary public, a man of considerable influence and fairly well to do. John Calvin was first educated for the Church, and before he was twelve years old, he was presented to a benefice in the cathedral of Noyon. Six years later he was appointed to the curacy of souls at Montville, doing the work of chaplain and pastor, although he was not ordained for the priesthood. However, his father at this time changed his mind as to the career of his son; he desired him to turn his attention to practise of law as the road to wealth. This change was acceptable to the son, who from the study of the Scriptures had become convinced of many of the errors of the Romish Church. He accordingly repaired to Orleans, where he studied under the famous jurist Peter Stella, and thence to Bourges, where Andrew Alciat, another prominent lawyer, filled the chair of jurisprudence, and where Melchior Wolmar, the Reformer, taught him Greek. Here Calvin was confirmed in the doctrines of the Reformation, and soon he began to preach them in the villages. However, as his father, in the mean while, had died, leaving him without funds, he returned to Noyon, but after a short period went to Paris, where in 1532 he published commentaries on Seneca's two books *De Clementia*.

Calvin now resigned his benefices and devoted himself to the study of theology. When, in 1533, the rector of the University of Paris, Cop by name, had occasion to write a discourse on the Festival of All Saints, Calvin persuaded him publicly to declare his opinion regarding the new doctrines. This brought upon them both the indignation of the Sorbonne. They were forced to leave the city. Calvin finally found shelter in the home of Louis du Tallet, a priest at Angoulême, where he supported himself by teaching Greek. Here he also composed the greater part of his famous

work *The Institutes of the Christian Religion,* which was published in 1536. Under the protection of the Queen of Navarre, sister of Francis I, he returned to Paris in 1534, but as the opposition against him was still strong, he quitted France the same year, having published a treatise in which he confuted the error of those who held that the soul between death and the resurrection remains in a state of sleep. He now went to Basle, in Switzerland, where in 1536 he published his *Institutes,* the design of which was to exhibit a full view of the doctrines of the Swiss Reformers. This work, written in Latin, he himself translated into French, and it has since been translated into all the principal modern languages. After the publication of the *Institutes* he went to Italy, where he was received with distinction by the Duchess of Ferrara, daughter of Louis XII. In spite of her protection he was obliged to leave Italy and now went to Geneva, where the Reformed religion had been publicly established the same year. At Geneva, at the request of Farel, Viret, and other eminent Reformers, he became a preacher of the Gospel and professor, or rather lecturer, of theology. Farel was twenty years older than Calvin, but they nevertheless united in effecting the complete reformation of Geneva. In the month of November a plan of church government and a confession of faith were laid before the public authorities of Geneva for their approval. These were sanctioned in the month of July, 1537. However, the popular will was not prepared for the severe discipline of the two reformers, and in a short time the people, under the direction of the libertine faction, met in public assembly and expelled Farel and Calvin from the city. Calvin now went to Berneand, afterwards to Strassburg, where he was appointed professor of theology and pastor of a French church. While at Strassburg, Calvin published a treatise on the Lord's Supper, in which he combated the opinions both of the Roman Catholics and the Lutherans. Here, too, he published his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.* Lastly, at Strassburg he entered into marriage with the widow of a converted Anabaptist preacher.

However, at Geneva conditions, in the mean while, had become chaotic, and so in May, 1541, the banishment of Farel and Calvin was revoked, and in the following September Calvin was received into the city amid the congratulations of his flock. He at once laid before the council a scheme of church government, and after it had been adopted and published by authority of the council (November 20, 1541), he did not hesitate rigidly to enforce it.

Calvin was now the ruling spirit in Geneva, and he desired to make the church which he had established there the mother and seminary of all the Reformed churches. His personal labors were unceasing. He established a university, the high character of which was long maintained; he made the city a literary mart and encouraged French refugees and others who sought his advice to apply themselves to the occupation of printer or librarian. Having finished the ecclesiastical regimen, he directed his attention to the improvement of the municipal government. These efforts were continued throughout the remaining twenty years of his life, during which he was active as preacher, teacher, writer, and statesman. To the very last he maintained the same firmness of character which had distinguished him through life. On his death-bed he called God to witness that he had preached the pure Gospel and exhorted all about him to walk worthy of the divine goodness. He died without a struggle on May 27, 1564, in his fifty-fifth year, having been ill the greater part of his life.

Calvin was a man of middle stature, naturally delicate, reticent, but nevertheless a man of unusual will-power. His habits were frugal and unostentatious. He had a clear understanding, an extraordinary memory, and a firmness and inflexibility of purpose which no opposition could overcome, no variety of objects could defeat, and no vicissitudes could shake. In his principles he was devout and sincere, and the purity of his character and private life was without a stain. His wedded life lasted only a few years and left him without issue at his death, his only child, a son, having died in infancy.

It is impossible to contemplate without astonishment the labors of Calvin during the last twenty years of his life. He presided over the ecclesiastical and political affairs of Geneva; he preached every day, lectured thrice a week, was present at every meeting of the Consistory, and nevertheless found time for a vast correspondence and voluminous literary labors. Besides his printed works there are now in the library of Geneva 2,025 sermons in MS. During the years in which he labored in Geneva he was in feeble health, and yet he continued attending to his manifold tasks almost to the very day of his death. He chose to be poor, refusing on several occasions proposed additions to his very moderate salary, and he is said uniformly to have declined receiving presents, unless for the sake of giving them to the poor. His entire property at his death amounted to only $225.

Influence.

The influence which John Calvin exerted, not only upon his own immediate surroundings, but over the whole of Europe, was tremendous. It was felt to a great extent in all the countries that received the Reformed faith. From Switzerland his doctrine spread over all Europe, being carried east to Hungary, Bohemia, and Poland; south to Italy; west to France; and north to Germany and Holland, even leaping the seas to England and Scotland. His first problem was to unite the two parties of Switzerland, the German in the north and the French in the south, who differed from one another not only in doctrine, but also as to church government. Gradually, however, Calvin's doctrines gained the victory in Switzerland, when, after some negotiations with Bullinger, the head leader of German Switzerland, they agreed, in 1549, on a new creed regarding the Lord's Supper, the so-called Tigurine Confession. Nor did his influence stop here. The Reformed churches in Germany, in Holland, England, Hungary, Scotland, etc., were the result of his ever-active and determined mind. However, not only on the theology of these countries did Calvin exert a striking influence, but also on their morals. Calvin's severe moral code, which made Geneva the model city of Europe, was to a greater or less extent followed in Switzerland and became the pattern of all nations that accepted the Calvinistic creed. Lastly, also, Calvin's social and political influence was very striking. Emelio Castelar, the leader of the Spanish Liberals, has declared that "Anglo-Saxon democracy is the product of the severe theology learned in the cities of Holland and Switzerland." Leopold von Ranke, the German historian, has given his weighty judgment in the words: "John Calvin was the virtual founder of America." James Anthony Froude, the English historian, has said that "nearly all the chief benefactors of the modern world have been Calvinists." (Vollmer, *Life of John Calvin.*) While these statements may be regarded as rather exaggerated, nevertheless they show how keenly the influence of Calvin has been felt up to the present time. Williston Walker, Titus Street Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University, in his biography of Calvin, writes: "In Western Europe no influence was to be compared, during the latter half of the sixteenth century, with that of Calvin." John Knox, the Reformer of Scotland, himself a disciple of John Calvin, maintained: "The most perfect school of Christ that ever was on the earth since the days of the apostles is the Reformed Christian Community in Geneva."

Influence of Calvinism in America.

That the influence of Calvinism in our own country should be pronounced is but natural, since all the leading colonies were largely settled by people who directly or indirectly accepted the religious tenets of John Calvin. It is estimated that of the three million Americans at the time of the American Revolution 900,000 were of Scotch-Irish descent; the German and Dutch Calvinists numbered 400,000; the Puritan English, 600,000. While the Roman Catholic Church exerted no influence whatever, and that of the Lutheran Church was insignificant, the entire country before and after the Revolutionary War was controlled by men who acknowledged the Calvinistic creed as their own. (Vollmer, *Life of John Calvin,* p. 209.) Among these were the great leaders of the Constitutional Convention: James Madison, a graduate of Princeton (Presbyterian), Alexander Hamilton, of Scotch parentage, whose familiarity with Presbyterian government is fully attested, and, above all, George Washington, who, though an Episcopalian, had a high regard for the Calvinistic tenets as represented in its strictest form by the Presbyterian Church. Indeed, at one time the respect for the Calvinistic Church during the Revolutionary days was so marked that it was feared by Christians of other denominations that it might become the established Church in America, just as in Scotland, Switzerland, etc. (Vollmer, *o. c.,* p. 212.) Our own historian Bancroft says: "The Revolution of 1776, so far as it was effected by religion, was a Presbyterian measure. It was the natural outgrowth of the principles which the Presbyterianism of the Old World planted in her sons, the English Puritans, the Scotch Covenanters, the French Huguenots, the Dutch Calvinists, and the Presbyterians of Ulster." Some one has declared that the American colonists were either atheists or Calvinists, which, though a sweeping statement exceeding the truth, still shows the power of Calvinistic influence in our country. Vollmer, *o. c.,* states: "Such is the relation of Calvinism to our national life, such is the answer which as Presbyterians and Reformed we give to the question, What have these principles done for the Republic? To-day, as we look over our broad national domains, as we see the 80,000,000 of our inhabitants in the enjoyment of education, of religious freedom, of civil liberty, of the blessings which the Federal Union has secured to the nation, we can say, This hath Calvinism wrought! This, too, is our answer to the assertion made by some ill-informed persons, in whose minds prejudice has usurped the throne of sound reason, the assertion

that Calvinism is dead! Dead? Calvinism dead? Its fundamental principles are maintained to-day in this land not only by the Presbyterian and the Reformed Churches, but also by Baptists, Congregationalists, and many Episcopalians. The majority of American Protestants are Calvinists. Calvinism dead? It will cease to be both life and power only when popular education shall give place to popular ignorance, when civil and religious liberty shall vanish, when the Republic shall be shattered into separate and warring nationalities, and when the very life shall have perished from government of the people, by the people, and for the people. But never shall such changes be. Oh, America, America! The sovereign hand of the Almighty rocked thy cradle, the eternal purpose sustained and nurtured thy founders, and we believe that the unchangeable divine decree hath ordained thee to be an indestructible State, the leader of the hopes of mankind, the majority of thy citizens servants of God and lovers of humanity, until the hour when God shall in truth dwell with men and all mankind shall be His people." (pp. 214. 215.) We have quoted this passage as characteristic of Calvinistic hope and purpose in our country to-day. In itself it throws valuable light, not only on the educational, but also on the political and social questions of to-day.

(To be continued.)

St. John's Church in Catawba Co., N. C., One Hundred and Twenty-Five Years Old.

CARROLL O. SMITH, Conover, N. C.

(Conclusion.)

III. Joins the Missouri Synod.

St. John's remained a member of the Tennessee Synod until she became a member of the English Missouri Synod by reason of the following course of events: —

To the fifty-fifth session of the Tennessee Synod, held in Mount Calvary Church, Page County, Va., 1875, Rev. J. M. Smith, in a letter, reported that, in a meeting held in St. John's Church for that purpose, "the congregations in Catawba County, North Carolina, had decided to establish a high school of strictly Lutheran character." Synod approved of that move and heartily commended the enterprise.

The sixtieth session of the Tennessee Synod, held in St. Peter's Church, Catawba County, N. C., passed the following resolution: —

"WHEREAS, The trustees of Concordia High School, Conover, North Carolina, have made a proposition to Synod to take this institution under her care and supervision; and

"WHEREAS, It is the desire and wish of this Synod to have an institution of learning in her connection; therefore be it

"Resolved, That a committee of three, on the part of Synod, be appointed to confer with the trustees of said school and prepare an agreement which may serve as a basis upon which said school may become the recognized institution of Synod, and that this committee be required to report to the next session of Synod."

At the next session this committee was not ready to report. However, it did make its report to the sixty-third session, held in the "chapel of Concordia College, Conover, North Carolina, October 13, 1883"; and the following resolution was passed by Synod: "That we, as a Synod, accept the propositions made to us by the Board of Trustees of Concordia College, and that . . . we will lend to said institution our fostering care, influence, and moral support."

It will be noted that Concordia High School had (in the year 1882) become Concordia College, and was now under the fostering care of the Tennessee Synod. The President, in his required annual report to Synod, spoke of the "flourishing" condition of the college. At its sixty-eighth session, Synod took action in regard "to the endowment of Concordia College," and at its sixty-ninth session a committee was appointed to secure $10,000 for the purpose of erecting new college buildings for Concordia College, declaring that the necessary endowment could not be secured with "the school conducted in the present building." However, about this time, through Mr. J. G. Hall, trustee of the Lenoir estate "in and near the town of Hickory," N. C., Synod received an offer of a new site for a college. A special session was called, and the proposition was discussed with much animation for "several days," and "Synod decided, by a small majority, to locate the college at Conover, N. C."

However, there were certain men in the synod who were fully convinced that Mr. Hall's offer must not be turned down. Among these was the entire faculty, which resigned in a body. The president of the college pulled down his privately owned house at Conover and moved it to Hickory, where he became president of a new institution, then called Lenoir College in honor of the donor of the site; now, Lenoir-Rhyne College.

This left Concordia College without a faculty. It was the duty of the Board of Trustees to provide one. Where could a faculty be found? They remembered that Dr. P. C. Henkel, who had come back from Missouri to North Carolina to become the first president of Concordia College, had, while in Missouri, helped to organize the English Missouri Synod. They knew, furthermore, that the president of the English Missouri Synod, at that time the Rev. F. Kuegele, was pastor of one of the congregations which formerly belonged to the Tennessee Synod. They knew that this English Missouri Synod was thoroughly orthodox. This synod was asked to take hold of the institution and run it. A committee, consisting of the Revs. William Dallmann and F. Kuegele, came to North Carolina and investigated Concordia College and the work connected with it. In consequence of a favorable report by this committee the Rev. Prof. W. H. T. Dau, D. D., was called to be president of the institution, and the Rev. Prof. G. A. Romoser was called to be a second member of the faculty. They began work with the opening term in September, 1892.

The next year St. John's pastor, the Rev. C. H. Bernheim, resigned, and the congregation called Professor Dau, who took charge of the congregation in July, 1893. This immediately opened the question of the congregation's synodical relation. Professor Dau was a member of the Missouri Synod, while the congregation belonged to the Tennessee Synod. Should they join the Missouri Synod with their pastor, or should their pastor join the Tennessee Synod with them?

Professor Dau said he was willing to join the Tennessee Synod with them, provided certain hindrances to his doing so could be removed.

What was wrong with the Tennessee Synod? Had it not withdrawn from the North Carolina Synod because it wanted to confess and practise four-square according to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church?

The trouble was that the Tennessee Synod, which had so laudably left the North Carolina Synod because of that synod's loose position with regard to confession and practise, had begun to drift back into that synod and had already taken action which left the Tennessee Synod in a compromising position.

Pursuant to "encouraging responses" and the fact that "common consent indicates the general desire," the "two Lutheran church journals in the South" called a diet of the "Lutheran synods of the South" to meet on November 12, 1884. This diet

met and was composed of delegates from the North Carolina Synod, Tennessee Synod, South Carolina Synod, Virginia Synod, Southwestern Virginia Synod, Georgia Synod, Holston Synod, and, later, the Mississippi Synod. As a Confessional Basis of "organic union" they declared "the Holy Scriptures, the inspired writings of the Old and New Testaments, the only standard of doctrine and church discipline." As "a true and faithful exhibition of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures" they mentioned by name the "three ancient symbols" and the "Unaltered Augsburg Confession of Faith." This Confessional Basis mentioned the other books of the "Christian Book of Concord" of 1580 as "true and Scriptural developments of the doctrines taught in the Augsburg Confession and in the perfect harmony of one and the same pure, Scriptural faith." Every delegate present, including those from the Tennessee Synod, voted for this Confessional Basis, although Dr. P. C. Henkel "requested that it be stated in the record of the diet that he approves the Constitution" (which was doctrinally, word for word, the same as the Confessional Basis) "so far as it goes, but that he declines to vote for it because it is silent in regard to pulpit- and altar-fellowship, secret societies, and chiliasm." In 1886, at Roanoke, Va., another diet was held, composed of delegates from the same synods, and the "votes by synods on the question of union" was taken. The Tennessee Synod gave 18 votes for and none against forming this union. All the other delegates voted for it. Then it was resolved that the name of this new body should be called "The United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South." The next day the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South met for its first convention, with the delegates of the Tennessee Synod sitting as constituent members of that body. But the report of these delegates to this new body contained the following significant words: "The Scriptural *premises* have in this way been laid down and agreed to, and by prudence, brotherly love, and the influences of the Holy Spirit the conclusions must be, ultimately, inevitable. But it will require patience and much judicious work to attain that higher and more churchly plane in regard to doctrine and practise." The delegates of the Tennessee Synod to the United Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the South in a later meeting, in reporting back to their synod, use these words: ". . . and it may require proper advice and instruction on the part of our Synod, at its next meeting, which should convene at a suitable time before the next meeting of the United Synod. There is a principle of the

highest interest to the Church involved in that regulation. Theory without consistent practise can avail little."

The fact is that there were men in the Tennessee Synod who felt that they were in bad company. They hoped that good would come of their walking with those with whom they were not really agreed, but at the same time they saw the danger with which they were surrounded and entertained fears as to the consequences. They knew that they were working with men in the North Carolina Synod and other synods of the South whose doctrinal position sounded good enough, but whose practise ran far behind their confession. These were, for the most part, the older men of the synod. The younger men, generally speaking, saw things in a different light. They had, no doubt, come under the influence of men from the General Synod with which these Southern synods had filled their pulpits because, on account of the lack of schools, they had few men from their own circles. In one thing they all, with the exception of the Revs. J. M. Smith, C. H. Bernheim, G. E. Long, and, later, A. L. Crouse, seemed to agree, and that was that they had some kind of an aversion for the Missouri Synod. They had heard it said that the Missouri Synod taught Calvinism, and some literature which had fallen into their hands seemed to prove this assertion. But, worst of all, the Missouri Synod was an interloper; it had come into a field where it had no business to be — into *their* field. By so doing it was endangering the success of Lenoir College, which, at first unofficially, later officially, was their school. Attempts were made to show them that they were wrong in their attitude toward the Missouri Synod. Private conferences were held, joint public debates were engaged in, literature was given into their hands — all to little avail, to say the most. The current had started to flow toward the United Synod in the South, and as time went on, it flowed more and more strongly, until finally the North Carolina Synod has swallowed up the Tennessee Synod and left it not even a name of its once glorious heritage!

Consequently, Professor Dau, the new pastor of St. John's Church, could not and would not join the Tennessee Synod. So there was but one thing for St. John's Church to do, and that was to join the Missouri Synod, which it did, true to its tradition of standing, for more than a hundred years now, for "God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure."

These hundred and twenty-five years of the existence of St. John's Church in Catawba Co., N. C., have been a proof of the grace and mercy of God. Although for a century she has held her

services in the same church where, once every month, a congregation of a different faith met for public worship; although, in several instances, the more subtle road to error has opened up for her under the form of a Lutheranism of a laxer sort, yet a guiding Hand has led her, so that, while to-day, in her cemetery, there lie the ashes of David Henkel and others who were uncompromising teachers of true Lutheranism, in her pulpit she has a man, Prof. C. F. Fredericks of Concordia College, who will know no other faith than that once delivered to the saints, and her members still sing:

Let me be Thine forever,
Thou faithful God and Lord;
Let me forsake Thee never,
Nor wander from Thy Word.

Lord, do not let me waver,
But give me steadfastness,
And for such grace forever
Thy holy name I'll bless.

Yes, with St. Paul she says: "By the grace of God I am what I am."

THE THEOLOGICAL OBSERVER.

Gains of the Churches in the United States in 1924. — The *Christian Herald* (March 7) writes: "Unfriendly critics have been asserting that the Church is losing its hold on the American people, and they have pointed to many tendencies in our national life to prove their point. These tendencies, however, are not inherent, and they are not general. And they are not proof of the living influence of the Church. Something far more pertinent and absolutely accurate is found in the *Christian Herald* Census of Religion for 1924, now completed and published in this issue, which shows for last year a net gain in membership of the churches of approximately 700,000. This represents a material increase over the gain in 1923. An extremely interesting fact is that with this year's gain the church-membership in the United States has increased 130 per cent. since 1891, while the population has increased 80 per cent., showing that the Church is far more than merely keeping pace with the country's advance."

According to the statistics of Dr. H. K. Carroll the total church-membership in the United States now amounts to 46,142,000. The Evangelical gain in 1924 was 366,336 members. The Evangelical strength at present is rated at 28,021,953, or over sixty per cent. The Roman Catholic Church is mentioned with nearly sixteen million communicants and more than eighteen million population. Its estimated increase in 1924 was over 220,000. Of the Protestant churches, the Methodists take the lead with 8,700,007 members. Then follow the Baptists with 8,227,225. Third in rank are the Lutherans with 2,503,642. The following tables show the relative strength of the Protestant bodies: —

Groups	*Communicants*	*Gains*
Methodist	8,700,007	79,974
Baptist	8,227,225	88,093
Lutheran	2,503,642	37,801
Presbyterian	2,500,466	37,909
Disciples of Christ	1,668,906	47,703
Episcopalian	1,147,814	7,738
Congregational	861,168	3,535
Reformed	532,668	32
United Brethren	405,103	10,540
Evangelical Synod	307,177	6,728
Evangelical Church	209,684	8,722
Adventists	144,167	4,819
Brethren (Dunkards)	143,889	1,192
Friends	116,077	33
Christians	108,500	5,409
Mennonites	85,639	3,000
Assemblies of God	75,000	5,000
Pentecostal	73,783	6,783
Scandinavian Evangelical	42,758	606
Moravians	26,802	804
Various other bodies	122,928	....
Totals	28,021,953	366,336

Dr. Carroll writes: "When the order by groups is considered, after the Roman Catholic and associated Churches, with 16,093,000, come the Methodist, 15 bodies, second, with 8,700,000; the Baptist, with 14 bodies, third, 8,227,225; the Lutheran, 18 bodies, fourth, 2,503,642; the Presbyterian, 9 bodies, fifth, 2,500,466; the Disciples of Christ, 2 bodies, sixth, 1,668,906; the Episcopalian, 2 bodies, seventh, 1,148,000. While we are passing in annual review the affairs of the Churches in the United States, it must not be forgotten that these same Churches have a great and growing constituency in the rest of the world. And some of them are reporting larger gains, mostly in non-Christian Asia and Africa, than in the United States. The *New World Missionary Atlas* shows that this foreign work is carried on in larger measure by the missionary societies of the United States than by any other or all other societies combined. They expended on this work, in 1923, $45,272,293. The recent American Foreign Missionary Convention in Washington was probably the most encouraging gathering of the sort ever held. Its reports were astonishing for the proofs of a large turning in the non-Christian world to the Christian appeal. In the last quarter of a century, as the *New York World Atlas* shows, the number of Christian communicants have increased in Asia from 622,460 to 1,533,057; in Africa from 342,857 to 1,015,683. In China the growth has been from 112,808 to 402,539; in India, from 376,617 to 811,505. Everywhere indigenous peoples have been moved by the Christian appeal. The Methodist Episcopal Church, which in 1923 had a larger increase in its foreign fields than at home, has also more of its total gains abroad than in this country the past year. If at any time the Churches at home get discouraged by a small increase here, they may get new enthusiasm for the task to see how bountifully it yields among the heathen."

Of course, we cannot place too much confidence in these figures, but take them at best only as "possibly right." MUELLER.

A race problem is developing for Great Britain in Sierra Leone, thinks W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, "one of the most brilliant and distinguished American writers of Negro descent." He has contributed a very informing article, based on personal investigation, to *Current History* for February, in which he says: "Very slowly, but certainly, there arose in British West Africa a group of Negroes with educated leadership, a few with the best modern university training. England was rather negligently proud of them. They were curiosities when they appeared in London. Queen Victoria's government promised them eventual autonomy and the chance to set up for themselves, presumably as an independent country. On March 3, 1865, a select committee of the House of Commons resolved 'that the object of our policy should be to encourage in the natives the exercise of those qualities which may render it possible for us more and more to transfer to them the administration of all the governments with a view to our ultimate withdrawal.' Pursuing this policy and with the energetic pushing forward of the Negroes, the colony was virtually in the hands of black folk by 1890. Sir Samuel Lewis, a colored man, had been Chief Justice, McCarthy was Queen's counsel, and people were voting and electing their own officials. Meantime matters changed. Africa became a great open land for new raw material. Instead of giving up African colonies, the European nations, after the middle of the nineteenth century, began to scramble for all the territory they could get there and by 1885 had it definitely divided up. English business began to move out to Africa, and when it moved to West Africa, it met the educated Negro leader. What happened? One can best sense this by going to Sierra Leone to-day. You see a country of black folk, of black folk of all degrees of wealth and education. At the governor's garden party I met black men and women of culture and manners. They would have been at home in any cultured assembly. Their dress was not that of the latest London tailors, and yet they were well dressed. The women perhaps, most of all, followed least the latest styles, and yet they were soft-voiced, restrained, and pleasant. It was interesting to see that garden party. The governor was conventionally English, tall and thin, with white top hat and morning coat. His wife was the gracious Great Lady. Around them were Englishmen and Negroes, but they did not mingle." The author describes that the aristocratic whites of Freetown are not the rulers of the country, though they have wrested the wholesale business and the judgeships to themselves. But in all trades and professions the bulk of the work is done by intelligent Negroes. Seemingly autonomous, they have become practically disfranchised to a degree that leaves them almost without power. This state of affairs is resented by the Negroes, who have become self-assertive and are planning a union of all Negroes in the British colonies. "Black British West Africa is out for self-rule, and in our day it is going to get it." The article deserves the attention of Americans because it is written by an American Negro, who con-

stantly parallels the condition of the American Negro with that of his African brother. The Negro problem in our own country is a huge problem and is calling for adjustment with growing insistence.

DAU.

"**The Church and Psychology**" is the title of an article which A. Haire Forester, of the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, contributes to the *Anglican Theological Review* (December, 1924). He is reviewing C. E. Hudson's *Recent Psychology and the Christian Religion*, J. W. Buckham's *Personality and Psychology*, F. R. Barry's *Christianity and Psychology* (all three Doran books), R. H. Thouless's *An Introduction to the Psychology of Religion*, and J. A. Hadfield's *The Psychology of Power* (both Macmillan books). The Freudian psychology, which has started all these inquiries, has invaded the domain of religion and is beginning to tell churchmen how they must do their work. Therefore churchmen are beginning to take the measure of their new psychological mentor. Freud is the third (after Copernicus and Darwin) who has "dealt human pride a staggering blow": he has discovered that, being at the mercy of unconscious impulses and animal instincts, man does not deserve the name of a rational being. Well, there are still some non-Copernicans and non-Darwinists on their feet, and far from being dazed, the former, for instance, are wondering what the Copernicans will do to Einstein. This staggering business seems to become reciprocal and a continuous performance in the world of scientists. As to Freud's discovery, the world has always known that it is giving domicile to some human brutes which certain self-respecting animals would not own as forty-second cousins. See Is. 1, 3 and Jer. 8, 7. Which is something like the problem that used to vex Dean Swift, *viz.*, whether beasts could ever degenerate into men. It may be, as Hadfield thinks, that "the next great conflict in religion will be in the realm of psychology, as in the last generation it was in the realm of biology"; but this will not be due to the discovery of any essential new facts. — What is this Freudian psychology? To pick out its constituent and outstanding features, the basis of the whole system is "that the instincts are the driving forces of human life. These instincts are certain primary forces which come into action in response to particular stimuli, each with a definite emotional tone and each resulting in a characteristic behavior. Sometimes they are named for the emotional tone, such as anger and fear, sometimes for the characteristic behavior, such as self-assertion and acquisitiveness. The dominance of these inherited instincts is the key-note of the 'New Psychology.' According to Freud the sex instinct is the motor of life; according to Trotter, the herd instinct; according to Lader, the self-assertive. All are probably right *at times*. Obviously their influence varies at different ages: at thirteen the boy must have his gang, at seventeen his girl. These instincts we share with the 'lower' animals. 'Many an undergraduate who walks down King's Parade in a yellow waistcoat during the Easter term is doing the same thing at the same time of the year and for the same reason as the peacock displaying his tail.' (Thouless, p. 120.) But the

instincts cannot all have free expression. The social code, itself fashioned to some extent by the herd instinct, forbids, and repressed complexes are the result. A complex is a system of emotions centering around an object and producing a morbid mental condition; if the resultant mental condition is a healthy one, a complex changes its name to a sentiment. The prison of repressed complexes is the unconscious mind, the most prominent feature in the Freudian system. The human mind is therefore, according to Freud, in three layers. The top layer is the conscious, with which we are aware of the newspaper we are reading; below it is the foreconscious, where the noises of the street, etc., reside while we read; at the bottom is the unconscious, where uninteresting things reside, like the difference between the gerund and gerundive in Latin grammar, and where painful things reside, 'painful memories, painful conflicts, and the wishes whose presence in consciousness would be painful because of the impossibility or undesirability of fulfilling them.'" My impression while reading Forester's review has been that it was difficult for him to keep a sober face while he was writing. *E. g.*, as a humorous remark this is exquisite: "The beginning of power is the knowledge of laws. That is why Freud's theory is epoch-making. It finds cause and effect in the working of the mind." *Mirabile dictu*, — *σέβας μ' ἔχει*, — the ancients would have exclaimed. The student of the "New Psychology" will bring away as gain from his labors a variety of new terms, some of them happy phrases of fine descriptive power — our age is great in phrases, slogans, etc. He will also be served a variety of theories. Happy is the student who is made to understand that the entire study is nothing but a theory, with which scientific men will work until they have found it unsatisfactory and then proceed to try another theory. For that is what theories are for. In the development of these theories there are many gaps. For instance, if one were to inquire whether the three-ply mind of the Freudian system is working according to fixed laws known to science, he would discover that the new psychology knows no such laws. There is no compelling reason why something should lodge in one particular layer of the mind. Nor are there known laws that govern the manifestations of anything that is in these layers, or that make us understand the interrelation of these layers and the causal effect of one upon the other. Yet, when you hear the devotee of the new psychology talk, you get the impression that the man has completely charted the mind and like an expert electrician knows just what button to touch to start or check a particular current. — Before this new psychology was launched, historians, philosophers, and poets studied the mind of men. In the dramas of the cultured world there is a great deal of psychology of the finest sort deposited. Our ordinary every-day life is filled with psychological facts. All that is missing in this old psychology is the modern terminology and the tyranny of the scientific theory. — What shall the Christian think of this new Goliath who is going to stagger the Church? In the first place, this science eliminates all consideration

of the divine element. It does not know Him of whom Solomon said in his great prayer: "Thou, even *Thou only,* knowest the hearts of all the children of men," 1 Kings 8, 39; Him who declared through Jeremiah: "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; *who can know it?* I, the Lord, search the heart, I try the reins," Jer. 17, 9 f. In the second place, the new science has no use for the Bible, and yet there is no book in the world that has so much to say about man's mind, the soul, the spirit, the heart, the reason, the will, the affections, the law within, the light within him, etc., as the Book that came from God. One reason why every one should believe in the divine origin of this Book is because it speaks with such authority and calm confidence about man's higher, invisible part: only a God could make this Book say the awe-inspiring things it says about the heart of man. Many men have been awe-struck by the intimate knowledge which this Book has of their very own selves. In the third place, the new psychology declines to accept as a fact the grace of the Holy Spirit operating through the appointed means of grace and hence refuses to admit that changes are wrought in men by the Spirit who moves as He lists, John 3, 8, hence is not controlled by any amount of science. With these three eliminations and denials, how far will the new psychologists get? Nevertheless these men are now dictating the pedagogy of the world and the ministrations of the missionaries and pastors of the Church, and, as on previous occasions, many are carried away from their safe moorings in the objective revelation of God, the Sacred Scriptures, by the glittering pretenses of these latest mind-readers. Lastly, it should be observed that the typical self-deception of all human philosophy takes place also in this new psychology; for its advocates, when they talk about *"the* human mind," can mean only their own mind, which they have projected out of themselves and now view as the standard mind. Or they have in their laboratories observed the minds of others and passed judgment on what they have seen in all these minds. This judgment, however, is built up by their own mind, and so is the entire psychological structure which is erected out of these judgments. The objective, normative, standard mind is as much a non-entity to these psychologists as it is to any ordinary man.

DAU.

The Language of the New Testament. — *Cui bono?* — that is the remark frequently heard, even from the lips of eminent theologians, when the question of the New Testament Greek is broached. The question is often put with a sneering emphasis, as though the questioner meant to infer that any one interested in modern lexicographical and philological research placed himself under the suspicion of displaying a tendency toward higher criticism in its most pernicious manifestation. To possible critics of this school one might say that just as much depends upon the correct attitude on this question as upon the proper understanding of any other language. The language of Chaucer is as English as that of Keats, that of Spencer as pure as that of Browning, that of Shakespeare as idiomatic as that of the foremost dramatist of to-day. Yet it would

obviously be foolish to say that this fact has no bearing upon the language as such and upon the understanding of the words and sentences as used by these masters. In many cases the meaning of words changes completely within the space of a century, and many phrases found in the great masters contain allusions which only a knowledge of local conditions will enable the student to understand. The same is true of the Greek language. The epics of Homer are just as Greek as the tragedies of Sophocles, the history of Xenophon as that of Josephus, and the fiery speeches of Demosthenes as the philosophical utterances of Plato. But here again the meaning of a word, of a phrase, of a figure, is determined not only by the etymology of a word, but also by its agreement with the context and the special, often local, meaning of the term employed. "There is no distinct Biblical Greek, and the New Testament Greek is not a variety of the LXX Greek," writes Dr. Robertson in his large grammar, p. 77. The *pia fraus* of a Palestinian Greek, which was held by some scholars as late as two decades ago, is exploded at the same time. What, then, is the question that demands solution? It is this: What is the actual status of the New Testament Greek? In what category shall we place it? How shall we approach its vocabulary?

For two centuries and more after the Reformation the so-called Purists defended their conception of the New Testament Greek as being classical, and of the Attic type, with a great show of learning. The principal exponent of this group was Pfochen. These men went to the extent of adducing parallels of phrase or matter for practically every verse in the entire New Testament. Winer, in the introduction to his grammar, indicates the false premises of these men and outlines the successful work of their opponents.* The Purists, or Classicists, were followed by the Hebraists, who insisted upon finding Hebrew structure, Hebrew phraseology, throughout the books of the New Testament. But their arguments also died of inanition. Men like Meyer, in his *Jesu Muttersprache,* and Dalman, in his *Jesus-Jeschua,* have stressed the Aramaic character of the New Testament Greek, especially in the speeches of Christ, and have even gone to the trouble of reconstructing the *Logia Christi* as distinguished from the *Logia Jesu* of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri in the West-Aramaic dialect. Others have argued, and are still arguing with a great deal of vehemence, that the language of the Greek New Testament is the Alexandrine dialect, as found in Philo and in the LXX, and have gone to the trouble of issuing a New Testament with interlinear parallels of phrase and matter (see THEOL. QUART., 1920, Oct., 206), fondly believing that they have constructed an insuperable bulwark for their theory. But along come scholars in the last quarter century who formulate no theories based upon preconceived notions, but produce letters and deeds and orders and receipts and legal and commercial instruments by the score, all written about the time

* "The Aramaic Background of the Gospels," in *Synoptic Problem,* 288 ff.

when the books of the New Testament were produced, and, strange to say, using largely the same language. The discoveries, especially of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, and their editing by Grenfell and Hunt, the work done by Deissmann in Germany and by Moulton and Milligan in their new *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament,* show that the work of Grimm, of Thayer, of Preuschen, even of Cremer and others, must be supplemented, if it is not, in many cases, superseded, by the results of recent studies. For it has now been shown beyond a doubt that the *κοινὴ διάλεκτος* was not the Greek language in its Attic revival, nor Hellenistic, nor Panhellenic Greek, but it was the language, both spoken and written, chiefly of the common people and the non-literati, throughout the Roman Empire, particularly in the last half of the first and in the second century. That the other influences mentioned above must also be considered, will, of course, be conceded by all, but not nearly in the measure formerly insisted upon.

The thesis, therefore, which may be stated with confidence, and will undoubtedly be defended most successfully, is this: While the writers of the New Testament were fairly familiar with, and were to some extent influenced by, the LXX, as their citations, allusions, and many parallel phrases show; while some of them at least made use of Aramaisms either in the effort to transcribe the speeches of Christ exactly, or unconsciously, by virtue of their early training, yet it remains true that the books of the New Testament were written in the Greek of the common people, the vernacular and literary *κοινή,* which was at that time the world-language, not only of commerce, but of every-day life. By keeping this fact in mind, we shall be able to translate the New Testament more correctly and to acquire a more perfect understanding of its *usus loquendi* and, therefore, of its meaning. P. E. KRETZMANN.

The Polonization of the territories out of which the present Republic of Poland is being artificially built up is described as a process of shocking brutality by Henri Barbusse in the *Nation* (March 11). All schools in which Polish is not taught are closed. For "reasons of state" imprisonments, confiscations, internments in concentration camps, breaking up of meetings and processions by sanguinary attacks of the police or the military are ordered by the Government continually. The prisons are choked with inmates who are treated in the most cruel fashion; for instance, they are compelled to use the same containers in which their food is brought them for easing themselves. "It is forbidden in Poland to have an opinion that is not in conformity with the government's views." Back of all this insane intolerance is Rome. "The nationalization of the new Poland includes an implacable fight in the field of religion. All that is not Catholic is forbidden, then ferreted out and destroyed. Men and women are put in prison solely because they belong to the Orthodox religion, because they follow some Methodist or Maryavist creed that developed and flourished under the Czarist *régime.* The 500 Orthodox churches have been taken over to be turned into Catholic churches or to be closed. The Orthodox ministers have been

arrested, interned in their cloisters, or deported. Ten primary schools of the Methodist ministers at Warsaw and a large number of schools and orphan asylums through the countryside have been raided by the police and closed, and the orphans flung out into the streets." Do you remember how many billions the righteous nation of the Poles owes the United States? It was money wrung from our people on the presentation of high moral reasons. — Back of Poland stands France, which looks upon Poland as "her Eastern warrior and bountifully aids and subsidizes" this republic, which demonstrates *ad oculos atque ad nares* what it means to "make the world safe for democracy." Do you remember for how many billions this enlightened, liberty- and fair-play-loving nation of ours had to "go down into their jeans" — so the Government poster which we patriotically hung in our parlor windows put it — to save "beloved France" from the terrible Huns? DAU.

The Catholic Church is not likely to insist on the use of fermented wine in the Mass, as is seen from the following communication to the *Commonweal* (February 25): —

TO THE EDITOR: — Loretto, Pa.

In your issue of January 28, in an article entitled "Barring Sacramental Wine," you say: "This monstrous measure [a proposed amendment in Colorado] would be especially grievous to Catholics. It would render the celebration of the Mass, the most sacred rite of the Church, indispensable to the practise of their religion, altogether impossible."

I beg to disagree with you. It would not render the celebration impossible. The proposed law is obnoxious, and it would bring grave inconvenience, but would it not be then a case of necessity? Doesn't our theology allow us to use non-intoxicant wine in case of necessity? Sabetti-Barrett, in the tract on the Eucharist, quotes: "New wine (*mustum*) or wine recently pressed from mature grapes (*ex uvis*) is indeed valid matter, but gravely illicit." A little further on he tells of ordinary wine being licit and valid and adds: "New wine (*mustum*) is valid matter, but outside the case of necessity it is gravely illicit." And still further down on the same page of this book the author says: "In the sacrifice of the Mass it is licit to use wine made from dried grapes so long as the liquid extracted from them can be recognized by its color, taste, and smell as true wine."

Would it seem that the use of grape-juice is prohibited in case of necessity? SEMINARIUS.

(The writer of this letter communicated his name to the *Commonweal*, but requested that his letter be signed, on publication, as above. THE EDITORS.)

DAU.

Esperanto, Science, and Church. — This topic is discussed by an Esthonian, G. Haller, in *Kristana Espero* (1924, p. 66) in the following vivid manner: Science and Church are both international and for that reason both stand in need of an international help-language. This need was felt already in medieval times, and there-

fore Medieval Latin (Low Latin) was formed as an international help-language. In this the grammar was somewhat simplified, and the vocabulary was adapted and enriched for the needs of that period.

The international character of Medieval Latin enabled the lover of sciences to migrate from university to university and study under the most famous teachers in any country. And in the monasteries people from different countries often assembled who could readily fraternize by means of this idiom.

Even to-day the sciences and the churches need an international language. The members of great European nations may not feel this need as keenly as do those of smaller nations. The former have in their own country a sufficient number of great universities and famous professors, and usually they can soon obtain translations of important scientific works rendered into their own language by foreign scholars. And if they meet with others in international conventions, they are in a position to express themselves in their mother tongues, since able interpreters are likely to be at hand who will translate to others what they say and for them what others say. But delegates from the smaller nations very often will lack this accommodation. But even in the former case, how much valuable time is lost with multiple translation of every utterance made during the discussion of a subject! How much time could be saved if all would express themselves in the same international help-language, or if at least the leading speakers would do so!

As international conventions are held to-day, the delegates of the various nations, even from Europe, but still more so from the near and far Orient, cannot discuss a subject under deliberation as easily and freely as in similar conventions of delegates from one of the greater nations using the language of their respective country. The many languages employed are an obstacle. For that reason the Oriental delegates of the League of Nations have voted for Esperanto as the convention language, although the French delegates are bitterly opposed to it. The Orientals give as the reason for their vote that they can learn Esperanto much more easily and quickly than any of the European languages, and that, if Esperanto were used, the delegates of all nations would have equal opportunities of expressing themselves on the floor of conventions. Especially the delegates of smaller nations would be benefited by the adoption of Esperanto as the international convention language for either political, scientific, or church conventions.

The universities of smaller nations would derive a very great benefit if Esperanto were more extensively used for scientific purposes than heretofore. Let me state, for example, how difficult the situation is in Tartu (Dorpat), Esthonia. Here every student has to know three languages and is obliged to attend Esthonian, German, and Russian lectures. Under such conditions no foreigner can study there, and if he would try it because he desires to hear a famous professor, he could attend only the German and possibly the Russian lectures. The ablest professor could not become famous if he lectured only in Esthonian. In this language it does not pay to

issue any great scientific book because it would have only a very limited sale. How the university in Esthonia could flourish if more foreign students, especially from Russia and the Baltic states, could study there! [When German prevailed there, it was a flourishing university.]

Latin I studied for eight years, six lessons a week. I know the language as it is customarily known; however, I cannot freely read Latin books, neither can I write the language faultlessly, as I wish I could. Only such as use Latin like a living language master it better. Esperanto, on the contrary, I learned much better in very much shorter time. After I had studied it for about eight days, about two hours daily, I could already read an Esperanto magazine and with the aid of the dictionary was able to write faultless Esperanto letters. The same can be accomplished by any educated person. Every graduate of a college (*Gymnasium,* or Latin school) can easily learn Esperanto in two to four semesters so well that he will be able to understand lectures in this language. If the university professors in Tartu [Dorpat], Esthonia, or Helsinki [Helsingfors], Finland, would lecture in Esperanto, these universities would be open to students from all Baltic states, Russia, and all other lands.

A Swedish engineer who could speak German only very poorly told me that he nevertheless knew the German technical terms better then the Swedish terms because, when he studied at the university in Sweden chiefly German scientific books were used. Now, if the universities of the smaller European nations would use the international help-language more generally instead of various foreign national languages, able professors at these universities would have a better opportunity to issue great scientific works in this language; for it would be easy for them to write errorless and they might reasonably hope that buyers of their books would not be lacking; besides, they might also get recognition from foreign lands.

On the other hand, if one of the universities in question desires to call a famous professor from abroad, how many and what great difficulties will block such an effort under present conditions! If the foreign scholar is asked to lecture not in his own language, but in that of the smaller nation, such a university will hardly succeed in getting him. What foreign scholar will consent to learn a foreign language to such an extent as to enable him to use it in his lectures? This would require at least a full year of very hard application to the task; and what great scholar will consent to lose so much time? However, if he is asked to give his lectures in Esperanto, the case is altogether different; for lectures in that world-language he can qualify in a fairly short time.

Thus the introduction of Esperanto as a medium of university lectures would help in every way to raise the usefulness of universities of the smaller nations; for this would enable them to call great foreign scholars whenever they need them and enable such men to lecture with ease to the students "per Esperanto."

The introduction of Esperanto would also facilitate church

interrelations among people of the same religious belief in small neighboring countries, a thing very much to be desired. If church congresses of the Baltic states were to convene, Esthonians, Finns, Latvians, Swedes, Danes, and Norwegians (and even visitors from Germany) certainly would need the international help-language Esperanto, otherwise the linguistic difficulties would be more or less insurmountable. So far German has served this purpose to some extent, though not quite satisfactorily. Now, however, the theological students from Esthonia and Latvia lose the ready command of this language because the university in Tartu [Dorpat] no longer has a German-speaking theological faculty. For similar reasons the German language will hereafter become more and more difficult to use for delegates from Finland, Denmark, Sweden, etc. Since the World War, nationalism is more pronounced everywhere, even in theological circles. However, theologians of these smaller nations can learn and master Esperanto in a short time, and if it is introduced in university courses, it will also spread the knowledge of this language among theologians and churchmen. This, in turn, will in due time greatly facilitate the use of Esperanto as the official language of church congresses, at least in the regions of the Baltic Sea.

No one who has acquired a higher education is too old to learn Esperanto. I was over fifty years when accidentally I got hold of a set of volumes of the *Bibliothek des Allgemeinen Wissens* and found among other languages a compend on Esperanto (by Christaller). I started to read it. The clearness, logic, and "learnability" interested me, convinced me, and quickly made me an Esperantist.

On the other hand, I learned Russian while I lived in the capital of Russia. I have studied it ten years at school and have spoken it often for about twenty-five years, and yet I would not undertake to write this essay in faultless Russian. In Esperanto, however, I am writing this without any difficulty, although I have not been an Esperantist for many years and learned Esperanto without a teacher and without an opportunity to hear it spoken during the time I was studying it.

Communicated by *Rev. Hanssen,* Bremer, Iowa.

The Organization of "Endeavorists." — *Time,* of March 30, writes: "Leopold Schepp, known as 'The Cocoanut King,' last week set aside $2,500,000 to found a most original organization. It will enroll boys of between twelve and sixteen, who will sign a pledge to abstain from bad habits, particularly alcohol, to comply with the laws of any country they may happen to be in, to treat their companions kindly, to make themselves better men for the women they are going to marry. If they keep the pledge for two years, they will receive from $100 to $200. They will be called 'Endeavorists.' Said Mr. Schepp: 'After two years they can do anything they like.'"

MUELLER.

In book reviews the note of authority is lacking. So Mary Austin has complained in the *Nation,* and the editor has taken up her complaint. It appears that our great dailies have begun to cater to the popular desire for literary opinion, and that youthful writers

who must have some kind of a start are flocking to these papers offering to "handle anything in *belles-lettres*, with occasionally something in history, or travel, or philosophy that is not too technical. No economics, please, or science!" Serious and sincere books are "likely as not reviewed by a young cub of twenty-three just out of college or an equally immature Jew, born in a Ghetto and raised on the East Side, who has to translate his thinking into English before putting it on paper." Lack of qualification for really authoritative criticism produces shallow and self-contradictory reviews that fill authors who are leading scholars in their department with indignation. Even the signature of these untutored writers on the book page of our dailies or magazines is no assurance, for in most cases it serves no higher purpose than that of airing an insignificant name. Whenever one of these upstart arbiters ventures too far in discussing the subject under review, he promptly reveals his ignorance. The honorable standards of criticism a generation or so ago have also been scrapped in our day. DAU.

War against Leaders of the Menighetsfakultet in Norway. — A special telegram to *Aftenposten* [Oslo, Norway], reads: "Stavanger, 11th September. A well-known preacher writes, among other things, in a letter to *Stavangeren:* 'It looks as though another church war were about to break out here in the West-country (*Vestlandet*). From 60 to 70 lay preachers, some of whom are known throughout the country, were lately assembled in Bergen, under the leadership of Pastor Lindeland, of Haugesund, for the purpose of taking a stand against the alleged false doctrine of the *Menighetsfakultet* as regards the inspiration of the Bible. In the mean time the call to battle has been made by taking exception to Professor Odland's position. . . . Professor Odland was the leading scientific scholar on the *Menighetsfakultet* at the time it was founded. They have also found fault with Hallesby, who of late years has been the most prominent man on the *Menighetsfakultet*. The late L. Dahle, General Secretary of the Norwegian Mission Society, has also, by the assembly in Bergen, been put on the list as a false teacher, as far as the inspiration of the Bible is concerned.'"

Communicated by *Rev. Faye*, St. Louis, Mo.

The Jesus of History and the Christ of the Church. — With reference to an article in *Tidens Tegn* by Prof. Dr. Sigmund Mowinckel, "The Jesus of History and the Christ of the Church," I would say that article is rather long, but that I venture to make two irrefutable assertions: 1) That no one will be at all wiser after having read it than before reading it; 2) that Professor Mowinckel himself knows neither the Christ of history nor the Christ of the Church. —

1) It is impossible to see that the Professor has helped the least little bit in the progress of "research." He attacks two other professors and their notions of a historical Christ. It seems to me that any rational person must see that what he tries to substitute, or to hint at, is a cloud, a mist: *Nubem fero pro Junone.* His concluding word, indeed, is that he awaits another scientific investigator,

who will be the one to inform us who the historical Christ is. Of some of the most important doctrines concerning the person of Christ he says that they will have to be investigated by historical research; philosophy and psychology of religion will have to settle matters. I ask, When? I cannot think of anything that can be less a fact or anything that so contradicts both Scripture and history as Professor Mowinckel's assertion: "It is easy to demonstrate historically that the blood-theological theory of vicarious atonement, which is not to be found in Scripture, but which was first developed in the Middle Ages by Anselm of Canterbury, does not belong to original Christianity and has not been put into the world by Jesus." Another quotation from him: "It is to be admitted that such notions as the Virgin Birth, metaphysical Sonship, bodily resurrection, etc., are mythology." John the Baptist called Jesus the Lamb of God, which beareth the sin of the world. The Apostle John says that the blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin. 1 John 1, 7. Paul says that if Christ be not raised, we are yet in our sins. 1 Cor. 15, 17. Read the story of the martyrs: their confession, their faith, why they gave their lives. Read, for instance, the Epistle to Diognete: "Christ reveals Himself to faith alone; with the eye of faith alone may one see God. God gave mankind over to sin that natural man's impotence in doing good might appear clearly. But this was to happen in order that the power of God be mightily established in us. God gave His Son, the Only-begotten, as a ransom for us, the Righteous in place of the unrighteous, the Immortal in place of the mortal. For what else could cover our sin but His righteousness? Oh, how sweet an exchange, oh, what inscrutable wisdom, oh, what unexpected benefits, that the unrighteousness of many is covered in one Righteous and the righteousness of One justifies many unrighteous! Faith leads to a living knowledge of God, and this again leads to joy manifesting itself in love of God; but love of God leads to brotherly love." So much for the author of the Epistle to Diognete, who says of himself that he is a disciple of the apostles. (Kahnis, *Kirkens Gang,* p. 80f.)

2) Professor Mowinckel has need of learning who the Christ of History is and who the Christ of the Church is. He does not know this, and he cannot know it, for he rejects the source of knowledge, the Word of God. Scripture is not, as Mowinckel asserts, a product of the Church; on the contrary, the Church is a product of Scripture. The Church was created by the first Gospel, the prophecy to Adam and Eve: The Seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head. Especially on the Day of Pentecost, when three thousand were added to the Church after Peter's sermon, was the Church established and armed for its world-embracing mission by the Word of God and the Holy Ghost, who made it an inspired Word. Scripture bears witness concerning itself that it is inspired by God, and Christ testifies that Scripture cannot err (or be broken). The Church is built upon the testimony of the apostles. Christ Himself is the Corner-stone. Eph. 2, 20; 4, 16. This is the confession of the Church and of believers from the first even unto this day. — *Scriptura*

Scripturae interpres. Scripture is its own interpreter; there is no need of an infallible Pope nor of any development by a scientific professor. We say, as we learned in our instruction for confirmation, that Scripture is quite clear enough in everything that is needful for salvation. Even in these days, when there are so many who put their reason above Scripture, who act (as good old Claudius says) like the fellow who would set the sun by his watch, — even in these days, I say, there is a great number of — I dare say — as learned theologians as Mowinckel who straightforwardly and plainly maintain that Scripture is a perfect and pure and clear fountain for all spiritual knowledge and wisdom, even if many "progressives" think they can ignore them. Of Reformed theologians I need mention but Gaussen, Haldane, Orr, Green, and Burgan; there are many others. I will again be permitted to recommend to all students the recently published work on dogmatics, in three large volumes, by the German Lutheran Professor Pieper. — H. J. S. ASTRUP.

Printed in *Tidens Tegn*, Oslo (formerly Christiania), Norway, and communicated by *Rev. Faye*, St. Louis, Mo.

It is not often that we can quote Henry Van Dyke, of Princeton, with anything like approval. Therefore these remarks of his on "The Inwardness of Evil" will be doubly relished: —

"We are often inclined to make the faults of our natures and dispositions the excuse of our misdeeds. But truly, if anything could increase our unworthiness, it would be just this fact, that our worst temptations come from within ourselves, and we are driven into wrong not by any outward tempest so much as by the force of our own impure and selfish passions. Never plead your natural dispositions as an excuse for evil deeds. But for the deeds the disposition would not have become confirmed. It is as base to love lying as it is to lie. It is as bad to have a murderous temper as it is to kill. It is the evil nature which God condemns. Let us make it not a cloak for sin, but a reason for penitence and a strong plea for help to overcome it. When a man really wishes to reform and do better, he should go to the root of the matter. His prayer should be: 'Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me.'"

Excepting the fourth sentence which fails to express adequately original sin, the author's sentiments are correct. DAU.

Sunday Law Enforcement. — The *Ottawa Citizen* of January 23 contained the following indignant letter: —

Editor, *Citizen:* — I have been reading in your papers lately of a certain religious organization that has been trying to get the Manitoba courts to pass laws to suit their own ideas, but am pleased to note that the courts have thrown out the appeal. I congratulate the men who had the sense of honor to throw out such laws and appeals, as no civil courts have any right to interfere with religion. The Babylonian custom of forcing the conscience by legislating upon matters of religious concern is being revived in this twentieth century. And, sad to relate, it is being revived with a high hand right here in this city by the so-called reformers who are endeavoring

to make everything blue on Sunday. Like the persecutors of former days, those who are most active in this work do not call it persecution, nor did the inquisitors call it persecution in Europe in medieval times, when even the streams flowed crimson with the blood of martyrs. They said they were only enforcing the law. That is what Nebuchadnezzar did when he put the three Hebrew worthies in the fiery furnace. That is all that Darius did when he put Daniel in the den of lions. That is what the Jews did when they took Christ to Pilate for condemnation and said, "We have a law, and by our law He ought to die." "Crucify Him, crucify Him!" "His blood be on us and on our children." "The law must be enforced," was the same sophistical plea of Nero when he burned Christians at the stake and thereby illuminated his pleasure gardens. The same sophistry was advanced by Caligula, Diocletian, and Domitian in justification of the martyrdom of more than five millions of the early Christians, who maintained that the Word of God must have first claim upon their devotions and allegiance. Religious laws should never be placed upon our statute books. Sunday laws already passed should be repealed. Enforced by the civil magistrate, they can result only in persecution. If men with religious convictions are of the right mettle, they will die for their faith, but never surrender. Religion is too sacred to be dragged into politics or regulated by civil law. Religious truth needs no support from civil government. Real Christianity, manifested in the life, furnishes its own recommendation, which is more powerful and convincing than the bluest blue-law ever enacted. A religion which cannot survive unless supported by civil law deserves to perish from the earth. It is good evidence that Christianity has become corrupted when it appeals for aid to Caesar instead of to Christ.

JAMES GIFFORD, R. 1, Hurdman's Bridge, Jan. 19, 1925.
Communicated by *Rev. H. Ruhland*, Ottawa, Ont.

Glimpses from the Observer's Window. — The blame for the opium evil is fixed thus by W. H. Graham Aspland, M. D., General Secretary of the International Anti-Opium Association, Peking, China: "So long as the monopolies of the East are annually raising from 22 to 46 per cent. of their revenue from opium or, as in the case of North Borneo, meeting the whole of their colonial expenditure by opium sales and pawnshops, it will be idle to say that the 8,000,000 Chinese in these territories are not being exploited for financial gain. Were it otherwise, surely these six nations signatories to the Hague convention [Great Britain, France, Holland, Siam, Japan, and Portugal] could have discovered in twelve years some method whereby their opium consumption would have been lessened. In the words of Bishop Brent [American Delegate to the Opium Conference at Geneva]: 'The love of money is, indeed, the root of all evil. As with individuals, so with governments. The crux of the matter is that narcotics are wealth- as well as vice-producing. Eliminate revenue, and what government would have further interest in the cultivation of the poppy?'" That's plain. But what, now, becomes of "righteousness," for which the League of Nations was organized? Is not its failure to settle the opium question another evidence of its *plunderbund* propensities?

France is meeting the problem of depopulation by importing huge numbers of Poles, Czechoslovaks, and Italians, all of whom are to be made over into excellent Frenchmen. In thirty years French may have ceased to be a national term and signify a hybrid conglomerate of Germanophobes.

Mussolini's connection with the Vatican, whose organ, *Osservatore Romano*, has been supporting him, is thus explained by Robert Senconet, American publicist now residing at Fiesole, Italy: "Why is Mussolini, long a Socialist and an unbeliever, a supporter of Catholicism, when, so far as can be seen, he is not in practise a consistent Catholic? When he was brought to the hospital with seventeen wounds or abrasions from the splinters of a bomb, he was visited, like any other wounded soldier, by the chaplain. This chaplain, Don Brizio, was a shrewd judge of character. He did not speak of religion to his patient; he spoke of patriotic journalism; he pointed out the need of a religion as a patriotic influence and reminded his hearer of its deep hold upon the Italian people. His words were not forgotten. Mussolini saw that religious principles and respect for the organization which provided them were necessary for a real national revival." But the Italian government needs Catholicism for other reasons: Catholicism brings money-spending pilgrims to Rome, to Loretto, to St. Antony of Padua; it loosens up a good deal of American money that flows into Italy. Mussolini is hated by vast numbers of Italians, but the Vatican is loath to drop him just now; for "another Matteotti murder would spoil the phenomenal success of the Holy Year." — And the best-laid schemes of mice and men, etc.

Whatever Ebert, the first president of the German Republic, was while living, he died a Catholic, and his Church did not miss the chance of a state-funeral under her auspices. The staff correspondent of the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, in reporting the affair, also had to inform us that hardly any one can be a successor to Ebert, except perhaps Marx, also a Roman Catholic, however, of a more pronounced type than the former Socialist Ebert.

The government of President Alessandri in Chile was recently overthrown, and Alessandri went to Venice and Rome. Now a new *coup d' état* is putting him back into power. "After a short interview with the Pope he left Rome for Paris on February 5," *en route* to Chile, whither he had wired the conditions on which he would resume the reins of government.

Watson Davis watched the solar eclipse on January 24 from the United States Navy dirigible *Los Angeles*. Describing the phenomenon, he remarks: "The star that we call the sun is so important that if it were eclipsed for a month, there would be few left to observe the final stage of that phenomenon."

How many famines have you counted within your most recent recollection? Just now one is ravaging seven counties of Ireland.

At Adelaide, Australia, there were riotings and protests against the influx of immigrants from Italy.

It is reported that the non-resistance policy of Mahatma Ghandi in India has broken down, and the extremist C. R. Das, with his well-organized following at Bombay, is now in power, working for Swaraj (Home Rule).

At Aix-en-Provence, France, a Catholic procession singing hymns on its way to the cathedral was met by a Communist procession singing the "International." Blows followed, and it required police intervention to prevent a serious battle.

During the debate on the abandonment of the French embassy at the Vatican, in the Chamber on January 19, the Pope was charged with having been pro-German during the World War. M. Herriot attacked the Pope with unusual "oral ferocity" and concluded by saying: "We do not have to take orders from the Pope." In an effort to adjust France's differences with the Vatican, the relation of Alsace-Lorraine to the papacy is to be continued on the basis of the old Napoleonic Concordat.

Out of a total of 7,064 divorces 143 were granted to Americans living in Paris and 151 to all other foreigners.

The monthly average of 40 for suicides in Vienna, Austria, rose to 149 in January.

Mussolini had been reported assassinated. His organ, *Popolo d' Italia*, declared this report a trick "to frighten away the pilgrims coming to Rome for the *Anno Santo* (Holy Year) and remarked: "The report fills us with anguish. Catholic quarters are convinced that people's lives in Italy are in danger. Why does not the Vatican contradict this abominable campaign against Italy, got up by Jews, Freemasons, and Protestants, working feverishly to wreck the Holy Year? It is a positive crusade of heretics, atheists, perverts, and Protestants against Catholicism, Rome, and the Pontiff. The Fascist Government is the only defense of religion from the yawning abyss. The Church is spiritually burgeoning in the calm spring air of Fascism."

The Czechoslovakian Government is trying to bring to an end the present close connection of the State with the Roman Catholic Church, which it inherited from the late monarchy. This country, too, is thinking of withdrawing its embassy at the Vatican.

Dr. Constantinos, Ecumenical Patriarch of the Greek Catholic Church, was unceremoniously ejected from Constantinople by the Turks. Mass-meetings, parades, and public demonstrations by members of the orthodox faith throughout Greece have voiced indignation at the treatment accorded to their supreme religious head.

"Never have crime, cruelty, attempts upon life and liberty been so wide-spread as in our time, which is truly the hell of history." (Henri Barbusse in the *Nation*, March 11.) File this with your favorite quotations, burning words, or the like, and serve it to the next representative of the Twentieth Century Continuous Self-admiration Club, who lives for the sole purpose of telling men how good they really are, if it were not for these theological declaimers on inherited misery.

The Italian government has issued a series of postage stamps commemorating "Anno Santo 1925," with views of the chief places of worship and scenes depicting the inaugural of the Holy Year. There is a surcharge on these stamps. DAU.

BOOK REVIEW.

An Elementary Christian Psychology. By *O. M. Norlie, Ph. D., S. T. D.*, Professor of Psychology, Luther College. 249 pp.; $1.25. (Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn.)

To write a Christian Psychology might seem a strange undertaking to many teachers of psychology accustomed to the usual rubbish that goes by that name and is built on the evolutionist theory, which deals with the human being as with an animal or plant. Yet, after all, nothing is true psychology which is not based upon, and does not agree with, those basic facts concerning the soul which are set forth in the Bible. Since the Fall, man no longer understands himself; sin has cast a veil over his soul. God, therefore, must needs enlighten him concerning the true condition of his inmost nature and being. Dr. Norlie's *Christian Psychology* is constructed on the basis of the true soul-facts expounded in Scripture, and for this we give him due credit; for it certainly requires boldness to depart from the common path. Also, his book has other advantages that commend it. It is scholarly, clear, progressive, and quite thorough in outlining the essentials of psychology. For a text-book on psychology it enters, perhaps, too deeply into the domain of Christian doctrine. The reviewer cannot, of course, subscribe to all statements made in the book. The definitions are often faulty. For example, faith is more than "the

religious faculty of the soul, . . . the power to believe." (p. 161.) Original sin is more than "deep corruption" (p. 180); it is the total depravity of our human nature. Nor is it true that "in spite of ignorance of God, . . . in spite of enmity against God, . . . in spite of absolute inability to believe in God, . . . the natural man longs after communion with God." (p. 183.) If man is ignorant of God, hates God, and is unable to believe in God, he cannot long after communion with Him. The corpse cannot long after life. So also the definition of conversion, namely, that "conversion is the act of the Holy Ghost by which He *drives* men . . . to take refuge in Christ" (p. 191) is in accord neither with Scripture nor with the Confessions of our Church. (*Conversio voluntatis nostrae depravatae revera nihil aliud est quam eiusdem resuscitatio a spirituali morte. Trigl.*, 912, 87.) There are other *naevi* that mar one's pleasure in reading this book, which, however, in spite of its faults, is worthy of close and serious study. MUELLER.

Addresses at the 175th Anniversary of the Ministerium of Pennsylvania. Reading, Pa., June 5, 1923.

The addresses contained in this brochure are of historical value to the student of the Lutheran Church in America, as they give the reader an insight into the development and the spirit of this branch of the Lutheran Church. MUELLER.

The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism. By *Melvin Grove Kyle, D. D., LL. D.* 340 pages of text, 24 of reference notes and subject index. Revised edition. $2.15. (Bibliotheca Sacra Company, Oberlin, O.)

To the readers of the THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY Dr. Kyle needs no introduction. In the field of archeology he is one of America's leading scholars, whose many articles on the important subject in which he specializes are always interesting, instructive, and, above all, trustworthy; for Dr. Kyle is not a radical, but a conservative, believing Bible student. In *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments* Dr. Kyle very ably answers the destructive attacks of negative and hostile critics and shows that the spade invariably vindicates the truth of Scripture. It is a book worth reading and in its revised form is still more useful than was the first edition, since it includes recent important discoveries and contains additional chapters on "Canons" and "Methods of Research." We cordially recommend this book especially to our college libraries. MUELLER.

The Chronology of the Bible. By *Philip Mauro.* 120 pp.; $1.00. (Hamilton Brothers' Scripture Truth Depot, 120 Tremont St., Boston 9, Mass.)

The purpose of this book is to show that the Bible "contains a complete and connected scheme of chronology, which has a definite starting-point (the creation of man) and pursues a definite line, to a definite objective — the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Son of God." Those interested in the chronology of the Bible will find in it much to interest them, although they will hardly agree with all the computations and arguments of the author. The final result of his reckoning does not differ radically from the figures of Ussher. According to Mauro, Christ was born Anno Hominis (the creation of man) 4041 and was

crucified A. H. 4075, which is equivalent to 30 A. D. The present year (1925 A. D.), according to his computation, would be A. H. 5970. He places the birth of Abraham at B. C. 2038, the beginning of David's reign at B. C. 983, and the end of the Kingdom of Israel at B. C. 640. Our interest in the matter is merely academical, but we agree with the author that also the chronology of the Old Testament was to serve the great event prophesied to fallen man, namely, man's redemption by the promised Messiah. MUELLER.

The Essentials of Christianity. By *Rev. Henry C. Sheldon, D. D.* Author of *New Testament Theology, Pantheistic Dilemmas and Other Essays in Philosophy and Religion*, etc. 307 pp.; $1.75. (George H. Doran Company, New York.)

This book was designed "for young people sufficiently advanced to understand, without serious difficulty, discussions in religion and theology embodied in non-technical phraseology." We doubt, however, whether even the most "sufficiently advanced" are able to follow the author's discussions and understand what he means. Certain it is that they cannot learn from his book what true Christianity is. The author does not believe in the infallibility of the verbally inspired Bible. He asks: "What matters it if some errors are found in items only externally related to the purpose of the Biblical revelation?" (p. 75.) He rejects the doctrine of Christ's vicarious atonement. "Nowhere," he argues, "is it said that the sacrifice of the Son of God was a procuring cause of the love of God to sinners." (p. 105.) He doubts the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost. "In many of the Scriptural passages the Spirit . . . might be regarded as denoting God in a particular order of manifestation rather than a distinct person in the Godhead." (p. 162.) He denies the total depravity of natural man. "It would be nothing less than a veritable hyperbole of pessimistic speech to describe them [men] under the name of 'total depravity.'" (p. 204.) These quotations prove that the author himself does not understand "the essentials of Christianity." MUELLER.

Brief Mention.

Matheteusate is the title of a pretty brochure, full of information and inspiration that has been issued by Synod's Fiscal Office with suggestions for using the brochure. It describes the missions of the Missouri Synod in the form of a trip around the world and is profusely illustrated. The credit for this publication belongs chiefly to *Rev. J. C. Baur* and *Mr. B. Taenzer*. It can be had gratis from the Financial Secretary.

The Walther League has issued a revised edition of its **Hospice Directory** for 1925, which is indispensable to some of our traveling young people. A gratis copy can be obtained from the General Offices of the Walther League, 6438 Eggleston Ave., Chicago, Ill. It has been prepared by Rev. E. Umbach, the secretary for the League's Welfare Work.

A group of members of Trinity Lutheran Congregation at Cape Girardeau, Mo., has issued a beautiful artistic folder to commemorate the dedication of their fine school on April 19, 1925. — From *Ivy L. Lee*, 4 E. 66th St., New York City, there has come **The Farewell Sermon of Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick to the First Presbyterian Church of New York** on Sunday, March 1. DAU.